

Appl. No. 10/756,972
Amdt. dated February 14, 2006
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2873

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-9 and 11-22 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 11, 12, and 17 have been amended and claim 10 has been canceled. No new matter has been added to the amended claims.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 10, 12, 14-17, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Garverick et al. (USP 6,543,286).

Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 11 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garverick et al. in view of Wu et al. (USP 6,542,653).

Claims 6, 13, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garverick et al. in view of Patel et al. (US 2002-0132389).

As amended, all the pending claims of the subject application comply with all requirements of 35 U.S.C. Accordingly, Applicants request examination and allowance of all pending claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claim 1 recites "A spatial light modulator for use in display applications" including "a plurality of hinges, each hinge directly connected to the spacer support frame and to a micro mirror plate, for allowing the micro mirror plate to rotate relative to the spacer support frame about an axis defined by the hinge," among other elements. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference does not teach or suggest at least these claim elements.

Garverick discusses a micromirror array including a number of cells including mirror plates mounted on gimbal structures used for optical switching. The mirror arrays discussed by Garverick are used in "wavelength division multiplexing (WDM) optical network" applications, not used in display applications are recited by claim 1. In fact, Garverick clearly contrasts the mirrors used in optical switching applications and discussed in the cited reference with MEMS mirror arrays "used as video display drivers." (Garverick at col. 3, lines 2-6). Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Garverick does not teach or suggest each element of the claimed invention.

Moreover, the gimbal structure design shown by Garverick does not teach or suggest that each hinge is "directly connected to the spacer support frame and to a micro mirror plate," as recited by claim 1. As alleged by the Examiner, FIG. 1 of Garverick indicates "each

Appl. No. 10/756,972
Amtdt. dated February 14, 2006
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2873

PATENT

hinge (114, 118) to be *indirectly* connected (via 110) to the support frame." (Office action at p. 10). As noted above, claim 1 now recites "a plurality of hinges, each hinge directly connected to the spacer support frame and to a micro mirror plate," which is not shown by Garverick. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is in a condition for allowance.

Claims 2, 5, and 21-22, which depend from claim 1, are in a condition for allowance, for at least the reasons discussed in relation to claim 1, as well as for the additional limitations they recite.

Claim 7 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 10, which has been canceled. Claim 7 recites a "single-chip spatial light modulator for use in a video display" including "a plurality of hinges, each hinge directly connected to the spacer support frame and to a micro mirror plate," among other elements. As discussed in relation to claim 1, the cited reference does not teach or suggest at least these claims elements. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is in a condition for allowance.

Claims 12 and 14-16, which depend from claim 7, are in a condition for allowance, for at least the reasons discussed in relation to claim 7, as well as for the additional limitations they recite.

Claim 17 recites a "spatial light modulator for use in a video display engine" including "a plurality of hinges, each hinge directly connected to the spacer support frame and to a micro mirror plate," among other elements. As discussed in relation to claims 1 and 7, the cited reference does not teach or suggest at least these claims elements. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is in a condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3, 4, and 6, which depend from claim 1, are in a condition for allowance, for at least the reasons discussed in relation to claim 1, as well as for the additional limitations they recite. Moreover, the cited references do not make up for the deficiency in Garverick. For at least these reasons, claims 3, 4, and 6 are in a condition for allowance.

Claims 8, 9, 11, and 13, which depend from claim 7, are in a condition for allowance, for at least the reasons discussed in relation to claim 7, as well as for the additional

Appl. No. 10/756,972
Amdt. dated February 14, 2006
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2873

PATENT

limitations they recite. Moreover, the cited references do not make up for the deficiency in Garverick. For at least these reasons, claims 8, 9, 11, and 13 are in a condition for allowance.


Claims 18-20, which depend from claim 17, are in a condition for allowance, for at least the reasons discussed in relation to claim 17, as well as for the additional limitations they recite. Moreover, the cited references do not make up for the deficiency in Garverick. For at least these reasons, claims 18-20 are in a condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,


Craig C. Largent
Reg. No. 56,400

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400 / Fax: 415-576-0300
CCL/ka
60657952 v1